

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 were presented for examination and were rejected. In the present amendment, claims 1, 4-6, 10, 11, 13 and 14 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-14 will be currently pending in this application, of which claims 1, 6 and 13 are independent. Claims 2-5 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1, as amended. Claims 7-12 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 6. Claim 14 depends on and incorporates all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 13, as amended. Applicants submit that claims 1-14 are in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicants traverse all rejections and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

I. Claims 1-14 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,032,260 to Sasmazel et al. (“Sasmazel”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2008/0086564 to Putman et al. (“Putman”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to the extent they are maintained over the claims as amended, and submit that Sasmazel and Putman, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

A. Independent Claims 1 and 6 Patentably Distinguished over Sasmazel and Putman

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. Claims 1 and 6 recite a ticketing authority server receiving a ticket generation request and information about a client node and assigning to the

generated derivative session ticket one of a plurality of session profile types configured by a policy engine. The assigned session profile type includes a session expiration date for the derivative session ticket. Sasmazel and Putman, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

The combination of Sasmazel and Putman does not teach or suggest a ticketing authority server assigning to the generated derivative session ticket one of a plurality of session profile types configured by a policy engine, the assigned session profile type including a session expiration date for the derivative session ticket. Sasmazel describes the structure of an electronic ticket and the validation or update of such a ticket. Sasmazel, however, fails to contemplate session profile types for assigning to a generated session ticket. Moreover, Sasmazel fails to teach or suggest a policy engine for configuring these session profile types, including session profile types configured with a session expiration date. Therefore, Applicants submit that Sasmazel fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

As with Sasmazel, Putman fails to teach or suggest the above-mentioned features of the claimed invention. Putman describes a system for managing a hierarchy of sessions associated with a user. Instead of assigning one of a plurality of session profile types to a derivative session ticket, Putman merely stores context information specific to each user session (see FIG. 11B) such as the particular service request and the session duration of a session (see paragraph [0211]). Putman also fails to contemplate a policy engine for configuring a plurality of session profile types to assign from. Consequently, Putman does not teach or suggest configuring an expiration date of a session ticket in a session profile type. Since Putman suffers from the same deficiencies as Sasmazel, Applicants submit that the combination of Sasmazel and Putman fails to teach or suggest at least the above-mentioned features of the claimed invention.

Because Sasmazel and Putman, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 6 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 2-5 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Claims 7-12 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 6. Thus, Applicants submit that dependent claims 2-5 and 7-12 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

B. Independent Claim 14 Patentably Distinguished over Sasmazel and Putman

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. Claim 14 recites a ticket authority server receiving a session ticket renewal request and a session ticket, retrieving the master session ticket associated with the received session ticket and renewing a session expiration date of the master session ticket. Claim 14 further recites retrieving any derivative ticket associated with the master session ticket and renewing a session expiration date of the derivative session ticket associated with the master session ticket. Sasmazel and Putman, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

The combination of Sasmazel and Putman does not teach or suggest a ticket authority server receiving a session ticket renewal request and a session ticket, retrieving the master session ticket associated with the received session ticket and any derivative ticket associated with the master session ticket, and renewing a session expiration date of each of the master session ticket and derivative session tickets. Instead of retrieving session tickets of another session (e.g., master or derivative session tickets) associated with a received session ticket for renewal, Sasmazel merely updates or replaces a ticket of the same session upon expiration of the ticket or

upon completion of a user request (see col. 8, lines 31-43). No existing tickets associated directly or indirectly to the received ticket are retrieved or renewed in Sasmazel. Thus, Sasmazel fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

As with Sasmazel, Putman fails to teach or suggest the above-mentioned feature of the claimed invention. Putman is cited for other purposes and does not bridge the deficiencies of Sasmazel. The Examiner relies on the session manager of Putman merely to relate a hierarchy of session tokens. However, Putman fails to contemplate renewing a session expiration date of any session ticket associated directly or indirectly to a received session ticket. In fact, Putman fails to teach or suggest retrieving tickets associated with a received ticket for any type of processing. Since Putman suffers from the same deficiencies as Sasmazel, Applicants submit that the combination of Sasmazel and Putman fails to teach or suggest at least the above-mentioned features of the claimed invention.

Since Sasmazel and Putman, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicants submit that independent claim 13 is patentable and in condition for allowance. Claim 14 depends on and incorporates all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 13. Thus, Applicants submit that dependent claim 14 is patentable and in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

CONCLUSION

In light of the aforementioned amendments and arguments, Applicants contend that each of the Examiners rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART, LLP

Dated: June 3, 2009

/John D. Lanza/

John D. Lanza

Registration No. 40,060

Attorney for Applicants

Choate, Hall & Stewart, LLP

Two International Place

Boston, MA 02110

(617) 248-5000